

## The Sun

THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 1889.

London office of The Sun, 10, Abchurch Lane, London, E.C. 4. Telephone 100. Telegrams: "The Sun," London.

Tories, Mugwumps, and Patriots.

We observe that in their selections of dependants of New York of the last year for places of prominence in the central proceedings, the committee of management make little distinction between the descendants of the Patriots of the Revolution and those who have in their veins the blood of Tories.

As New York continued in the hands of the British throughout the Revolution, it was, of course, a place of refuge for the Tories. There was no comfort, and there was no property for anybody who was not loyal to King George. The Patriots were driven out of town and their property was confiscated, while the Tory merchants made all the money. Toryism was fashionable and patriotism was despised.

There were also many Mugwumps here at that period. They were the men who remained neutral, with a prejudice in favor of British ways. The rugged patriots were vulgar in their eyes, and they kept aloof from distinctly American politics as low and unbecomingly to people of their consequence. Besides, Mugwumpism was not fashionable, but it was profitable. They took their position between the lines of the opposing parties, as the Mugwumps of to-day do, ready to throw their strength to the one side or the other, as their interest might dictate. They were the political fence-sitters of the period.

But the Tories and the Mugwumps of New York had a hard time of it when the Patriots won the victory and at last came into possession of the town. Then the situation was reversed. The Patriots did the worst to the Tories. They pursued the poor Tories and the Mugwumps with positive malignity. When the Legislature was assembled, they petitioned that the king-lovers and turn-coats should be driven out of the place as public nuisances and enemies of the public peace. They ostracized them socially and disfranchised them. It was impossible for Whigs and Tories to live in harmony, as the speakers at a meeting held in the Vanderbilt coffee house in 1784 declared. Great numbers of the enemies of the patriotic cause had already fled to Nova Scotia, the Bahamas, and England, but enough of them remained to keep the Whigs in continual rage.

A century has passed since then, and of late years it has been the boast of certain families that they have Tory descent. But when it comes to picking out representatives of the old stock for distinction during the centennial ceremonies, they are hardly the families to be so honored. Even now the American spirit is not strong among them. The fires of patriotism burn in them. In the ranks of the immigrants and the descendants of the immigrants whom the republic has received during the last forty years. The so proud and loyal citizens may not crowd to the banquet tables, and they may not be in the cotton at the ball, but many thousands of them will march in the processions and a million of them will watch the progress of the display, and glory in it as a demonstration of American patriotism.

## One of the Very Worst.

In the last batch of bills sent to us by our Albany correspondent, we find one which has been introduced into the Assembly by Mr. FRANK P. DEMAREST of Rockland county, which is entitled "An act to provide for the enforcement and collection of debts incurred for the necessities of life," and which is about the worst bill of the present session of the Legislature that has fallen under our notice.

Under the law of this State as it now exists, a man who sues another for debt cannot seize the debtor's property as security for his claim prior to the rendition of judgment in the suit, unless the debtor is a non-resident of the State, or is about to dispose of his property, or has disposed of it with intent to defraud his creditors. Such a seizure of the goods of a debtor at the beginning of a suit is known to lawyers as an attachment, and the law does not permit an attachment against honest resident debtors. The general tendency of legislation in this State with reference to suits for the collection of debts has been to refrain from any interference with the property of the person against whom the claim is made until that claim has been established by the judgment of a court.

But Mr. DEMAREST's bill would change all this. It provides that any person, corporation, or association that shall sell or furnish any of the necessities of life to any person, where the total value of such necessities which have not been paid for at the time of bringing suit shall be not less than \$5 nor more than \$100, may sue the person to whom such necessities have been furnished, by obtaining a writ of attachment against his property; and under this warrant the Sheriff may seize twenty percent of the wages or salary of the alleged debtor. The bill further provides that the term "necessaries of life," within the meaning of the act, shall include food, medicine, shelter, and clothing.

Let us see what would be some of the effects of this bill if allowed to become a law. Any grocer who had a claim of \$5 against a laboring man could, upon bringing suit for the claim, cause one-fifth of the man's wages to be seized by the Sheriff as security till the end of the suit, whether the price of a loaf of bread was \$5 more than his customer had agreed to pay for it, or whether the Sheriff take the property of that customer and hold it until the question was settled by a court. And the bill would even cover the claims of landlords, inasmuch as it defines shelter as one of the necessities of life. It would afford to a landlord a very much more drastic remedy than he finds in the present law for the dispossession of tenants. A landlord who had a claim against a poor man would simply sue him by obtaining a warrant of attachment, under which the Sheriff would seize the tenant's goods and keep them until the suit was decided.

Not only is the scheme embodied in this measure radically at variance with the tendency of legislation in this State up to the present time, but it seems to be distinctly directed against the poor, or those who are in comparatively humble circumstances. If any suits are to be begun by the seizure of the property of honest resident debtors, why should not all suits be begun in this way. Instead of only such as involve claims which are not less than \$5 and not more than \$100 in amount? Why should there be any distinction in favor of those who can obtain large credits? Why should the goods of the poor man be subject to attachment when the goods of the rich man are not?

Perhaps Mr. FRANK P. DEMAREST of Rock-

land county will answer these questions and defend his bill. It needs defense, and needs it badly. It strikes us as a systematic device to enable those who deal with the poor to exact prompt payment of their claims by excessively and exceptionally high legal measures, which the poor, if the commodity is not for an instant instant applied to themselves or their property. The enactment of such a law could not be justified, and no member of the Legislature who supports it can justly claim to be considered a Democrat. We notice that it is stated to have been introduced by Mr. DEMAREST "by request." We cannot conjecture him upon his good judgment in complying with such a request. A member of the Legislature is not wholly relieved of responsibility for a measure because he introduces it at the instance of others. He should take care not to father bad bills, and Mr. DEMAREST cannot disown this one too soon.

## More Land for Settlers.

The appointment by the President of a Commission to review negotiations for the purchase of land for the Sioux reservation in Dakota, is a reminder that an area six times as great as Oklahoma will probably soon be opened to settlement. There is plenty of chance yet for those who have failed to get the kind of homestead they want. The Oklahoma tract, bought of the Creeks and Seminoles, contains, in round numbers, 1,857,000 acres; the Cherokee Strip, which will probably be bought this summer, contains 6,022,000; but the portion of the Sioux reserve which Gen. CROOK's Commission will endeavor to purchase, under the recent act of Congress, amounts to more than 1,000,000 acres. The extension of the commission to the Sioux land impulse which throwing them open will give to the Northwest, and the facilities which will be offered by the railroads of that region, make these negotiations very important.

The Commission appointed last year for the same purpose by President CLEVELAND reported that eight objections were made by the Sioux. These objections the Commissioners regarded as excuses for rejecting any reasonable proposal; and they declared that "the defeat of this act was a victory for indolence, barbarism, and degradation, as against the influence of the farm, the workshop, the schools, and the Gospel." Secretary VILAS, however, invited the leading chiefs to a conference at Washington, and there offered them better terms. These were also rejected, yet for reasons so clearly put as to look like anything rather than the devices of ignorance and degradation. They showed that the Sioux had learned something about land values and about the way to make bargains.

The Government wanted to give them fifty cents an acre for their lands, to have its own system of investing this money and paying out the income, and to follow its own notions of reservation boundaries and of the distribution of the proceeds of subsequent sales to settlers. The Indians objected to all this, and Congress took up their suggestions and partly conformed its plans to them. The Indians had asked for \$125 per acre, and asked directly for their credit in the Treasury, with interest at 5 per cent. They also insisted on the fulfillment of certain stipulations of former treaties. Congress consented to a change in the boundaries of two of the reservations, and stipulated that the Indians should receive the proceeds of lands sold to settlers at \$125 per acre for the first three years; at 75 cents for the next two, and at 50 cents for the ensuing five, and that the Government should take all the lands then unsold at 50 cents per acre.

There is ground for believing that this compromise will be satisfactory. The maximum price is the same as the Indians offered themselves; yet since it applies only to lands taken within three years, probably it is no more than fair, because the choice lots will doubtless have been selected by the end of that period. Then there will be a reduction in price for the second and third picks of the land. Some of it, no doubt, is very poor, yet the Government can afford to pay fifty cents an acre for it to complete the trade. A hundred other changes were made in the original plan, including the fixing of a higher price on lands taken for schools or religious purposes. Thus far all that has been heard from the Sioux reservations points toward the success of this plan.

## The Women of England.

At the present time the woman question is much more discussed in England than in this country. The recent failure of the Woman's Suffrage bill in the Legislature of this State has made the question for numerous commentators, and even the increasing extent to which the women of Kansas are using the privilege of municipal suffrage, as shown at the late town elections, has recently more passing attention. But in England, and nearly all of the magazines of the more serious kind are considering various phases of the woman question with reference to the bills before Parliament for granting the suffrage to women.

The most striking of these discussions takes place in the *Fortnightly Review* for the present month. Mrs. FAWCETT writing in favor of those bills and Mr. STUART GLENIE in opposition. The arguments advanced by each are substantially those to which we have been accustomed during the forty years of controversy over woman suffrage. Mrs. FAWCETT contends that "a sense of national responsibility is such an immensely valuable influence on character that it is most desirable to admit women to a share in government. To admit women to the men, and to let them broaden and strengthen their minds tends to better fit them for the performance of their natural function. Great men do not spring from feeble mothers." As England's best chance of keeping its place among "the masculine nations of Europe," says Mrs. FAWCETT, "is to go on steadily developing the large degree of freedom and power already allowed to women." Mr. GLENIE quotes the text of his article, the remark of Lord Salisbury to a delegate of the Primrose League at Edinburgh in November. "I earnestly hope," said Lord Salisbury, "that the day is not far distant when women will bear their share in voting for members in the political world, and in determining the policy of this country." When that day comes, it is ever comes, Mr. GLENIE feels confident that it will be the beginning of "social and political disaster." For he takes the view already presented by Prof. GOLDWIN SMITH, that to give the suffrage to women is to pass over to them the control of the State, they being in the majority.

The bill before Parliament are two, one restricting woman suffrage to widows and spinsters, and the same conditions as entitle men to vote, and the other providing that the "words" in the Representation of the People Act, importing the masculine gender, shall include women. Mr. GLENIE concludes, therefore, very reasonably, that if woman suffrage is granted at all, it will immediately or ultimately be extended so as to put women on a political equality with men. "Manhood suffrage would mean womanhood," suffrage, and as there are half a million more women than men in England, it would further mean "the political subjugation of men" to women. He entitles his paper "The Proposed Subjugation of Men."

But there seems to be a very plain drift toward woman suffrage in England. The Primrose League, which added to itself 120,000 members last year, is contributing to the result on the Conservative side, and the Women's Liberal Unionist Association and the Women's Liberal Federation are also preparing the way by bringing women into active participation in electoral contests. Feminine interest in politics is small and slight with us as compared with England. Therefore it looks now as if we might borrow this innovation, as we borrow so many of our customs and fashions, from the more revolutionary country on the other side of the water.

## Albany and the State.

The Republican members of the present Senate of this State have been entertaining the country with an uncommon sort of circus. Their time is short. Their present exhortation may be regarded as a lightning before death. Their official life lasts about three weeks longer. We hope that their successors will be fewer in number and more worthy of the name of potent, wise, and venerable senators. There is good prospect that the Senate to be elected next fall will be somewhat more representative of the majority of the people of New York than is the present one. The refusal, the persistent, unconstitutional refusal of the Republicans to give the Democrats a fair and proportionate representation in the Legislature by an enumeration of the inhabitants of the State, will continue to give the minority party an advantage which the Democrats will have to make extraordinary exertions to overcome. On the other hand, the humbug and demagogism displayed by the present Legislature, and especially by the more unpopular branch of it, ought to prove of great help to the Democrats in the legislative elections of next fall.

The majority in the Senate has been disgustingly hypocritical and obsequious. Its treatment of the temperance question has been enough to estrange the Prohibitionists, the shrewd High License men, and even the Republican saloon keepers. The latter body is the only one it has really displayed any zeal for. As Republicans they may be satisfied with the Republican manœuvring at Albany. As saloon keepers it may occur to them that their rights would be better asserted and maintained by a policy of frankness. As for the High License men, we may take it for granted that they want a practicable High License bill, an honest, indiscriminating bill, a bill passed to become a law, and not framed and passed to be vetoed. Honesty is the best policy, and so the Republicans may yet learn.

It is proper, however, for the Democrats to reflect that the Republican treatment of High License and of the movement for ballot reform is calculated to strengthen the Republicans in the country. The Republicans have declared for ballot reform in the cities but not in the country. They have declared for excise reform in the cities but not in the country, the country districts being at present under the lowest license and the cities under the highest. Depending on the result of their own inquiry, depending on the fact that the failure to take a census hurts the Democrats in the growing parts and helps the Republicans in the stationary parts of the Commonwealth, the Republicans of the Legislature have frankly set the country against the cities. This, to be sure, has been the ordinary Republican policy. This city, known by bitter experience how steadily that policy has been pursued. The Republicans of the Legislature will die three weeks from Thursday have been particularly active in that line. The Republicans in the Senate have been indolently active. The city of New York has excellent reason to be ungrateful to them.

It is unnecessary to remark upon the folly, to call it by no darker name, of legislation or attempt at legislation which is not intended for the State as a whole, but meant to be a line of division between the correlated and inseparable cities and the country. The country is the basis of the State. Can the dwellers in the suburbs and the town be brought to believe much longer that it is good for them or conducive to the prosperity of the State of New York to be made the tools of greedy and morally dishonest legislators? Are the people in the cities fully aware of the imposition put upon them?

The Senate to be elected this year will take part in the election of a Senator in Congress to succeed the Hon. WILLIAM MAXWELL EVARTS. Will not the Democrats of the country towns and of the cities do their best to secure the election of a Democrat and break the long tradition of minority rule? Will not fair-minded, conservative citizens and humbug? The citizens of New York, and every other city in the State are in large measure recruits from the country. For the country to set itself against the cities, for the cities to set themselves against the country, is for the hand to quarrel with the heart, for brothers to prey upon one another.

## Salt and Sugar.

The free trade sugar was cooked in Kansas with salt and sugar. Citizens of Hutchinson, baring in their town for natural gas, drilled with increasing amazement through a bed of the purest rock salt, till they went wild with joy over 300 continuous feet as the final measure of the thickness of the wonderful deposit. This was a year and a half ago. Speedy surveys and borings over a large neighboring area demonstrated that Kansas possesses a bed of pure rock salt 300 miles long, 25 miles wide, and 400 feet thick. The discovery excited the State. Mr. Johns was the first to suggest that foreign salt forthwith be prohibited from the market. Also about eighteen months ago the prospect of economically making sugar from sorghum was finally wrested by Kansas experimenters from reluctant nature. No other State in the Union has so much of the salt, and possesses so perfectly the climate, necessary to the perfection of the sorghum plant. In her own market she can beat Louisiana, France, Germany, the East and West Indies, and South America in the economical production of sugar. She can produce it for about two cents a pound. She thinks that with tariff protection she will be able to beat all sugar-making foreigners out of her market.

This is why Kansas is against free trade, especially in salt and sugar.

## The Centennial Marching.

The proper ambition for every militia organization of every State. To march as well on the day of the centennial parade as our untrained but extremely welcome visitors, the West Point cadets.

These lovely youths are the tip-top professionals of the evolutionary art. Their military exhibitions are things of real beauty, totally apart from the exquisite surroundings of their home up the river. For a body of troops with whom drilling is an avocation their style may be fairly regarded as unapproachable. None the less it should be the object of earnest and undiscovered emulation on the part of all less practiced citizens who will compare steps with them.

on April 30. The vast crowd which will watch them all on that day hopes that the very best foot may be foremost, with every organization of the present before their eyes. Then every military expert along the line will look with amazement at the perfection of the display.

For that admirable combination so characteristic of this peaceful land, the gentleman and the soldier, April 30 should be one of the most glorious days in our history.

Our esteemed contemporary, the *Commercial Gazette* of Cincinnati, has some very philosophical remarks upon the departure of Mr. WATKINS from the State. "He makes a tremendous success, but what are we to think of the case of a man who surrenders the control of such a paper as the *New York Tribune*, because he has become a subordinate of the Government," says our contemporary. "He makes a tremendous success, but what are we to think of the case of a man who surrenders the control of such a paper as the *Commercial Gazette*, also in order to become a subordinate of the Government; and when such an aspiration is nullified by the adverse decision of the State, he is left with a paper which is almost entirely ignored or discriminated against in the vast river and harbor bills and in general appropriation by the Government."

We fear the fact and the opinion of our distinguished Ohio contemporary are not entirely consistent with each other.

The people of this city, old folks as well as youngsters, are learning a great deal in these days about the Revolutionary history of our country and the founders of our republic. It is well. The history is inspiring and the founders were noble characters.

We do not sympathize with the suggestion that Gov. HILL, because of his Polo grounds veto, should not be admitted to any game in which the New York players play this season. The Governor should not be blamed. He did his best.

As for the implacable faces wreathed, though, that are condemned to sit upon the vacant benches looking towards every afternoon from 10 to 6, to gaze upon the dreary arena from which their insatiable greed for appropriation has driven into wandering misery those countless thousands of their happy fellows who used to cheer and curse the various measures, and even the Republican saloon keepers. The latter body is the only one it has really displayed any zeal for. As Republicans they may be satisfied with the Republican manœuvring at Albany. As saloon keepers it may occur to them that their rights would be better asserted and maintained by a policy of frankness. As for the High License men, we may take it for granted that they want a practicable High License bill, an honest, indiscriminating bill, a bill passed to become a law, and not framed and passed to be vetoed. Honesty is the best policy, and so the Republicans may yet learn.

The regular income of JOHN D. ROCKEFELLER is twenty millions of dollars a year. That makes him the richest man in the United States, perhaps the very richest in the world. He is a Baptist.

It must be admitted that, though there have been a few small flights and a prodigious amount of scrambling among the Oklahoma pioneers, the great rush to the Territory has been a failure. The country has been a failure with a marvellous degree of order and good humor. The correspondents of THE SUN have given many interesting facts on the subject. Very bodies of claimants have waited in line to make filings for their quarter sections, and the land offices have been in full operation. At the same time the Southern Republic has been declared for ballot reform in the cities but not in the country. They have declared for excise reform in the cities but not in the country, the country districts being at present under the lowest license and the cities under the highest. Depending on the result of their own inquiry, depending on the fact that the failure to take a census hurts the Democrats in the growing parts and helps the Republicans in the stationary parts of the Commonwealth, the Republicans of the Legislature have frankly set the country against the cities. This, to be sure, has been the ordinary Republican policy. This city, known by bitter experience how steadily that policy has been pursued. The Republicans of the Legislature will die three weeks from Thursday have been particularly active in that line. The Republicans in the Senate have been indolently active. The city of New York has excellent reason to be ungrateful to them.

The military parade in New York on the 20th will be the grandest that has been seen by the present generation. -*Albany Centinel*.

Yes, and it will go through in splendid shape if the city of New York will only stop and talk too long on the Sub-Treasury story. It will have to wait for them and the people will have to wait for the parade.

A few days ago a Jewish child in Boston asked the learned Rabbi SUNDEN for a favor. He wanted to know if the Jews were a good people. The Rabbi answered him in the affirmative. The child then asked him if he might be allowed to publish and it is interesting. The Rabbi gives two reasons for declining the invitation. In the first place, he objects to religious or racial distinctions in the club. "The Jew," he says, "could not to separate himself from others or from the club of the Jews." It is the next place, he speaks of the Jews as a race, which he had asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "I do not know that Jewish language when you mention as your idea. There is not such a thing as a Jewish language. What you refer to is a jargon which only the uneducated speak." Of course the Jewish child was startled by this lecture on the subject of language, and he asked him to address them. He says: "